2001 DSM ACTIVITIES PROGRAM YEAR Jan. 1,2001 - Dec. 31, 2001

FITCHBURG GAS & ELECTRIC LIGHT COMPANY ELECTRIC DSM PROGRAMS	T COMPAN Jan-01	<b>≺</b> Feb-01	Mar-01	Apr-01	May-01	Jun-01	Jul-01	Aug-01	Sep-01	Oct-01	Nov-01	Dec-01	Totals:Program Year to Date	
SWALL COMMERCIAL LIGHTING PROGRAM G-1 NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: INCREMENTAL CAPACITY SAVINGS(kW) TOTAL ANNUAL ENERGY SAVINGS(kWH) ADDITIONAL CONTRACTORS COST: G-1 REBATE AMOUNT:G-1;G-6		6-1	6-1	6-1	6-1	6-1	G-1 1 0.7 2946 859.79	G-1	6-1	6-1	6-1	G-1 3 8.7 24,434 \$3,642.32	9.4 9.4 7.380 0 84,502.11	(1)
SMALL COMMERCIAL LIGHTING PROGRAM G-2 NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: INCREMENTAL CAPACITY SAVINGS(kW) TOTAL ANNUAL ENERGY SAVINGS(kWH) ADDITIONAL CONTRACTORS COST: G-2 REBATE AMOUNT:G-2:G-4	G-2	G-2 1 5.35 26,851 \$6,180.00	G-2 1 1.5 3,629 \$765.51	G-2	G-2	6.2	G-2 2 12.3 32.989 \$11,670.83	6-2	G-2 5 10.6 43,291 \$15,960.07	6-2	G-2 2 8.3 24,204 \$15,195.20	G-2 5 25.2 76,468 \$26,168.21	16 63.25 207,432 0.00 \$75,939.82	(2)
COMPREHENSIVE EFFICIENCY PROGRAM G-2 NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: INCREMENTAL CAPACITY SAVINGS(KW) TOTAL ANNUAL ENERGY SAVINGS(KWH) PROJECT COST: INCREMENTAL CUSTOMER COST: CUSTOMER COST:	G-2	G-2 2 30.1 132.706 \$28,404.00 \$14,202.00	G-2 2 17.00 68,000 \$108,400.00	6.5	6-2	6-5	G-2 1 20.60 105,949 \$20,787.00 \$10,393.50	6-2	G-2 2 16.90 48.262 \$12,813.00 \$6,406.50	G-2 2 16.90 70,105 \$35,395.50 \$17,697.75	G-2 1 24.00 97.833 \$16,083.00	G-2 3 25.80 87.908 \$48,924.92 \$26,908.45	42	(3)
AUDITS AND/OR ENGINEERING SERVICES G-2 MOTOR REBATE PARTICIPANTS MOTOR SAVINGS:(kWH) MOTOR REBATES REBATE AMOUNT:G-2:G-4		\$14,202.00	1 2,170 \$215.00 \$31,120.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00 \$10,393.50	\$0.00	\$0.00 \$6,406.50	\$0.00	\$0.00 \$5,341.50	\$0.00 \$22,016.47	\$0.00 0 2,170 \$215.00 \$107,177.72	(4)
COMPREHENSIVE EFFICIENCY PROGRAM G-3 NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS: INCREMENTAL CAPACITY SAVINGS(kW) ANNUAL ON-PEAK ENERGY SAVINGS(kWH) ANNUAL ON-PEAK ENERGY SAVINGS(kWH)	G-3 1 21.0 81,900	G-3 1 13.9 97,836	G-3	6-3	G-3 2 35.0 128,596	6-3	G-3 1 24.40 104,305	G-3 3 58.57 155,736	6-3	G-3 1 133.45 520,436	6-3	G-3 1 45.00 175,277	10 331.27 1,264,086	
<u>~</u>	₹	13,900 111,736 \$43,207.00	0	0	\$39,114.55	0	\$17,344.72	\$83,878.00	00.00	\$333,280.00	\$0.00	\$6,133 273,432 \$13,851.50 \$6,925.75	\$707,793.77 \$707,793.77 \$0.00 \$311,929.47	Docke
	1 5,577 \$220.00 \$41,118.00	\$21,603.50	1 2,170 \$215.00	4 5,460 \$300.00	\$100.00 \$19,557.28		\$4,900.00	\$39,599.00		\$85,000.00		\$6,925.75	53	
2001 DSM PROGRAM SUMMARIES 473/2013 FNERGY SERVICES: FD M	∑ G		SC&I G1 SC&I G2	Small C&I 27,380 (1) 207,432 (2) 234,812	(1)	CEP G2 CEP G3 Motors G3 Motors G3	CEP 610,763 (3) 2,270,392 (4) 2,170 (5) 13,207 (6) 2,896,531	(c, 6, 6, 6) (d) (d) (d) (d) (d) (d) (d) (d) (d) (d					SC&I 1 and CEP 1	03-26, Exhibit D.T.E. 1-2b mmercial & Industrial 2001

### Small C&I Prospects & Commitm 2001

Completes:

kW	kWH	Rebate	Less t	han 30 kW
5.35	26,851	\$6,180.00	Yes	G-2
1.50	3,629	\$765.51	Yes	G-2
7.47	13,978	\$8,235.20	Yes	G-2
4.80	19,011	\$3,435.63	Yes	G-2
0.70	2,946	\$859.79	Yes	G-1
2.00	6,407	<b>\$2,665</b> .60	Yes	G-3
1.70	7,670	\$1,515.36	Yes	G-2
2.80	7,334	\$4,431.20	Yes	G-2
0.30	1,011	\$325.66	Yes	G-2
3.82	20,869	\$7,022.25	(No)	G-2
5.39	15,169	<b>\$11,644.00</b>	Yes	G-2
2.90	9,035	\$3,551.20	Yes	G-2
0.20	623	\$249.00	Yes	G-1
2.00	6,234	\$2,394.00	Yes	G-2
1.10	3,313	\$1,805.00	Yes	G-2
0.30	2,012	\$1,324.19	Yes	G-1
11.80	39,320	\$15,110.00	Yes	G-2
8.30	21,188	<b>\$5,568.81</b>	(No	G-2
8.20	21,799	\$2,069.13	Yes	G-1
2.00	6,413	\$1,290.00	Yes	G-2
				< 30 KW

234,812 \$ 80,441.53

### 3.1 NEEP MOTOR INITIATIVE

(These notes are from last month's meeting. They are included here for continuity)

### Participants:

Bruce Benkhart	APT	Beth Poulin	National Grid
Jeanne Emond	APT	Jon Linn	NEEP
Rich Rusnica	Bangor Hydro	Cherie Miles	NSTAR
Ted Jones	CEE	Ed McGlynn	NSTAR
Scott Hutchins	DOE	Kate Evans	NU
Lou Holzberger	GPUE	Dick Schondelmeier	NÙ
Mike Roddy	GPUE	Michelle LeMoine	UI
Phil Mosenthal	MA Collab	Greg Rahe	Unitil

Purpose of Meeting: The meeting's purpose was to share an update of field activities for September and October, and to plan initiative goals and activities for year 2002.

The field update reflected a bleak ambient economy. We heard about low sales volume of motors, a shift to 'repair' rather than 'replace', and even about some vendor closings. The field technicians, though, continue to build relationships with suppliers, and the list of active vendors (those processing relates for 5 or more new customers during the year) increased to 57. We customarily see a rush in motor sales in November and December, however this year may be a let-down.

Sponsors expressed generally favorable responses to Xenergy's final report of the MotorUp evaluation. The feeling was that we 'got our money's worth', and that the document would serve as a useful reference. It also served as a useful guide for initiative planning.

In the 2002 'planning' discussion, the initiative focus continued to grow to 'motor management' by embracing the national 'Motor Decisions Matter' campaign, and concentrating on outreach activities. A shift in focus will be deliberate, but not drastic. Current marketing tactics, rebates, vendor incentives, newsletters, and personal contact will continue. The approach however will be increasingly integrated, with central theme of 'motor management', and consistent message to all market players. MDM serves to target corporate managers, field technicians service the dealers, and sponsor representatives engage plant personnel. The group made final adjustments to the implementation budget for 2002, and set up a process to develop indicators for use as guidelines for APT's activities.

1

### 2001 METRIC UPDATE

### **Premium Efficiency Motors**

Metric #1. Statewide assure that (X) motor vendors sell qualifying motors to 5+customers.

Threshold = 30 Vendors
Design = 33 Vendors
Exemplary=36 Vendors

Status: Currently MA Utilities have 13 vendors selling to 5 or more customers. APT has been advised that the number must reach 36 vendors by the end of the year. National Grid and NStar are running a bonus program to boost dealer participation.

Metric #2 Statewide assure that (X) facility managers, building engineers, purchasing personnel or contractors who are responsible for motor operation and maintenance or motor purchasing decisions in a facility in MA attend Motor Repair Seminars.

Threshold = 24 Participants
Design = 30 Participants
Exemplary > 36 Participants

Status: MotorUP workshops have trained 41 participants. The Massachusetts utilities have achieved the exemplary level for this metric.

### Unitary HVAC Equipment Efficiency (Cool Choice)

Metric #1. Provide (X) rebates statewide for units meeting for CEE Tier II Standard through the Cool Choice Initiative form or an in house utility program.

Threshold = 404 Rebates

Design = 538 Rebates Exemplary=672 Rebates

Status: Currently utilities have rebated 367 units in Massachusetts. This is the count through mid-November We remain hopeful at being able to attain the Threshold level for this metric.

Metric #2 Investigate and plan to make rebates for high performance economizers available January 1, 2001.

Threshold = n/a

Design = complete investigation and finalize plan for 2002 Exemplary = Bundled Regional Metric #6

Eventher A. Daniel Regional Mettic #0

Status: The plan for having rebates for high performance economizers is completed. At a minimum, the design level of this metric has been achieved. Please check the language of Bundled Regional Metric #6 for Exemplary level guidelines.

### **Energy Star Homes Program (JMC)**

### Energy Star Homes Program (JMC)

Metric #1 In 2001, attain an 18.5% market share of new homes built in MA

Threshold = 16%

Design = 18.5% Exemplary= 21%

Status: The MA utilities are currently right on target to meet the Design goal for this metric. The current level is 17.66%.

appendix b

В

### NEEP HVAC INITIATIVE ATTACHMENTS

2001 Year to Date Magrann Summary and Detailed Report

TraynorKirk&Co. Cool Choice Marketing Campaign

### COOL CHOICE - UTILITY REBATE RECAP YTD REPORT (2 YEAR YTD COMPARISON) 12/31/01

			2001 Vallais
	Trun.	0.0183	and tomes - Region of

### Connecticut

# of Tier I:	53	77		
# of Tier II:	86	107		
# of PTAC's:	237	254		
Total:	376	438	\$107,653.62	\$118,163.25
Colored State		e-25 T		THE RESIDENCE
# of Tier I:	43	20		
# of Tier II:	23	35		
# of PTAC's:	41	186		
Total:	107	241	\$37,069.00	\$46,631.00

### Massachusetts

- Tabbathabatta				
	7 P7 1			
# of Tier I:	94	125		
# of Tier II	93	305		
# of PTAC's:	45	622		
Total:	232	1052	\$105,922.00	\$167,734.65
# of Tier I:	67	410		
I TE	100	(310)		
# of PTAC's:	247	845		
Total:	379	1565	\$77,463.45	\$307,079.72
			i i	
# of Tier I:	20	19		
	12	(32)		
# of PTAC's:	40	143		
Total:	72	204	\$26,430.00	\$52,838.50
The many Step & Hearten				
# of Tier I:	0	2		
	0	(3)		
# of PTAC's:	0	0		
Total:	0	5	0	\$1,830.00
Pada Light Cambad 1994				AND SHAREST PARTY
# of Tier I:	0	4		
TALES!	0	(2)		
# of PTAC's:	0	0		
Total:	0	6	0	\$4,358.43

662 /

### 2001 METRIC UPDATE

### **Premium Efficiency Motors**

Metric #1. Statewide assure that (X) motor vendors sell qualifying motors to 5+customers.

Threshold = 30 Vendors
Design = 33 Vendors
Exemplary=36 Vendors

Status: Currently MA Utilities have 13 vendors selling to 5 or more customers. APT has been advised that the number must reach 36 vendors by the end of the year. National Grid and NStar are running a bonus program to boost dealer participation.

Metric #2 Statewide assure that (X) facility managers, building engineers, purchasing personnel or contractors who are responsible for motor operation and maintenance or motor purchasing decisions in a facility in MA attend Motor Repair Seminars.

Threshold = 24 Participants
Design = 30 Participants
Exemplary 36 Participants

Status: MotorUP workshops have trained 41 participants. The Massachusetts utilities have achieved the exemplary level for this metric.

### Unitary HVAC Equipment Efficiency (Cool Choice)

Metric #1. Provide (X) rebates statewide for units meeting for CEE Tier II Standard through the Cool Choice Initiative form or an in house utility program.

Threshold = 404 Rebates

Design = 538 Rebates Exemplary=672 Rebates

Status: Currently utilities have rebated 367 units in Massachusetts. This is the count through mid-November. We remain hopeful at being able to attain the Threshold level for this metric.

Metric #2 Investigate and plan to make rebates for high performance economizers available January 1, 2001.

Threshold = n/a

Design = complete investigation and finalize plan for 2002 Exemplary = Bundled Regional Metric #6

Status: The plan for having rebates for high performance economizers is completed. At a minimum, the design level of this metric has been achieved. Please check the language of Bundled Regional Metric #6 for Exemplary level guidelines.

### **Energy Star Homes Program (JMC)**

Energy Star Homes Program (JMC)

Metric #1 In 2001, attain an 18.5% market share of new homes built in MA

Threshold = 16%

Design = 18.5% Exemplary= 21%

Status: The MA utilities are currently right on target to meet the Design goal for this metric. The current level is 17.66%.



## DesignLights<sup>TM</sup> Consortium Lighting $knowhow^{TM}$ Series Training Seminars

Brief Summary of Year 2001

Prepared by: ICF Consulting 200 Centerville Road, Suite 9 Warwick, RI 02886

### Introduction

The DesignLights<sup>TM</sup> Consortium lighting knowhow<sup>TM</sup> Series training, as implemented by ICF Consulting in 2001, proved to be a successful training series once again. In total, 383 lighting decision makers, 243 of whom work in Massachusetts, were trained through the DLC Program. This is 160 percent of the total goal (goal of 240) and 304 percent of the metric for MA (goal of 80)<sup>1</sup>. We were able to increase our efficiencies through a variety of actions, resulting in our ability to train more people with a smaller budget. As compared to the first year, we were able to decrease our costs per training by over 30 percent. We worked closely with the sponsors to exceed all project goals and to do so significantly ahead of schedule and under budget.

We received an overwhelming positive response from the organizations we worked with in 2001. At the end of the document, we have attached some of that correspondence to provide you with insights and feedback. At the end we have also provided a summary of the date, location, and attendance at each seminar as well as the full list of attendees.

### Promoting DLC Seminars to the Lighting Community

Leveraging the success of the DLC program in 2000 and our industry contacts, this year ICF continued to focus on electrical contractors, and also widen our promotional activities to include facility managers, manufacturer representatives, lighting distributors, and architects. The result of a more expansive promotional campaign, was a more diverse audience at many of the DLC seminars. For example, at a seminar co-hosted by the Watt Stopper in Warwick, RI, the audience consisted of several architects, facility managers, and engineers, with the remainder consisting of electrical contractors.

The Watt Stopper seminar also serves as a perfect example of our expanded approach to identifying training opportunities. Watt Stopper was one of the companies we approached to cohost a DLC session in 2001. They provided ICF with a mailing list of customers to invite to the program and they covered the cost of the room and food for the seminar. After the DLC presentation, they spoke to the group about how new codes affect lighting control applications. By clearly communicating the benefits of co-hosting these seminars, we were able to leverage the resources of several companies, similar to Watt Stopper, often having them cover the costs of the room, food, and occasionally the advertising costs. By investing their own time and money into these events, the co-hosts were motivated to bring people to the seminars and to make them as successful as possible. Because of their knowledge of the market area and familiarity with those attending, co-hosts were able to give specific examples of potential projects in the area where the DLC Guides could be used to influence end-users. They were able to refer to specific products that contractors could use to meet the DLC guidelines for high quality energy efficient lighting.

This diversity in presentation format allowed us to increase the number of trainings by 33 percent (20 conducted as compared to the goal of 15), without negatively impacting the overall project budget.

Relying on co-hosts in this fashion had positive and negative effects. Several times this year co-hosts canceled their scheduled seminars. The success of the presentation became vulnerable to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> These figures include 49 lighting decision makers (47 in MA) trained by DLC Sponsor staff, but do not include Build Boston.

Status: The MA utilities have easily exceeded the exemplary level for this metric.

Metric #2 Statewide, in 2001, assure that (X) building engineers, technicians, contractors or operators who are responsible for the O&M of a facility in MA are enrolled in the course work for the NEEP operated Level 2 O&M Training & Certification Program.

Threshold = 19 Participants
Design = 25 Participants
Exemplary=31 Participants

Status: The MA utilities have exceeded the exemplary level for this metric.

### **Design Lights Consortium**

Metric #1 Statewide by the end of 2001 train (X) electrical contractors, designers, end users responsible for significant amounts of space, and other lighting vendors. To count toward the metric, the person or firm must have an office in MA.

Threshold = 51 Participants
Design = 68 Participant
Exemplary=85 Participants

Status: Engaging the target audience has been problematic. ICF has asked for utility intervention to help boost attendance at training sessions but the utilities have been slow to respond. To date only very few people have participated in the training sessions (10), and several have had to be cancelled due to low participation rates. Several training sessions are scheduled for November, including one sponsored by Unitil/FG&E and Massachusetts Electric at the Best Western in Fitchburg taking place on November 30<sup>th</sup>.

Metric #2 Complete (X) demonstration sites state wide using the most recent knowhow guidelines: Retail Skylighting, Warehouse-Industrial Skylighting, High-bay Industrial (all released in 2000) and Low bay Industrial (due to be released in May 2001)

Threshold = n/a

Design = na/ Exemplary=1

Status: We have identified a potential site and are in the process of studying the cost effectiveness of the project and the customer's willingness to participate.

### **Energy Star Appliances & Lighting**

### **Appliances**

Metric #1 Achieve an annual market share for ES clothes washer in MA of 20% in 2001

Threshold = 18% market share

Design = 20% market share Exemplary=22% market share

Status: Averaging the first two quarters of D&R data for 2001, the total market share for MA is 18.5%. If this remains constant, the threshold level will be achieved.

### Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships, Inc.







December 5, 2001

Ed Mailloux Unitil/Fitchburg Electric 6 Liberty Lane West Hampton, NH 03842-1720

### Dear Ed Mailloux:

I'm writing to express my sincere thanks for your organization's generous sponsorship that helped make our regional workshop Maximizing Energy Efficiency and Environmental Benefits: Linking Energy Codes and Equipment Standards with Efficiency Programs a success.

We were pleased that you were among the eighty-three people who attended the workshop on November 7 and 8. With the participation of an excellent and diverse group of speakers and panelists, the workshop addressed:

- Roles for building energy codes and minimum equipment efficiency standards to achieve cost-effective energy savings and meet environmental and energy policy goals;
- Policy and program options to link energy codes and equipment standards with energy efficiency programs; and
- How Northeast states are improving the effectiveness of building energy codes implementation.

We were especially pleased to report our analysis of the energy, economic and environmental benefits in the Northeast from improved building energy codes and new minimum efficiency standards. The analysis shows the potential for tremendous savings by the year 2020:

- \$46 billion in gas and electric bill savings;
- 25,000 MW of displaced growth in electric demand in the Northeast RTO nearly equal to the current demand of the NEPOOL system; and
- 70,000 GWh of displaced growth in electric energy requirements equivalent to nearly the entire 1998 electric energy requirement of the state of New Jersey.

All of this can be accomplished using technologies and practices available now, many of which today's voluntary programs offer in the Northeast. The workshop included a productive discussion about realizing these benefits through closer coordination of energy efficiency policy and programs. NEEP will continue its regional work to inform and assist such efforts, and looks forward to new opportunities to work with Unitil/Fitchburg Electric in that regard.

### Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships, Inc.







October 10, 2001

Ed Mailloux Unitil/Fitchburg Gas and Electric Co. 6 Liberty Lane West Hampton, New Hampshire 03842-1720

Dear Ed:

Thank you for your response to our co-sponsorship request for our regional workshop, Maximizing Energy Efficiency and Environmental Benefits: Linking Energy Codes and Equipment Standards with Energy Efficiency Programs. The workshop is scheduled for Wednesday and Thursday November 7 and 8, 2001 at the Merrill Lynch Conference and Training Center located in Plainsboro, New Jersey.

We are very pleased that Unitil/Fitchburg Gas and Electric Co. will provide funding at our Sponsor level of \$500. Through your participation, we are one step closer to our goal of increasing understanding of the optimal roles for energy codes and equipment standards in meeting environmental and energy policy goals. As we mentioned in our request to you, the workshop will stimulate and support integration of some of the principal means by which environmental and energy efficiency goals of Northeast states may be met.

It is our understanding that you have authorized your company to send us a check in the amount of the sponsorship. We have registered you to attend the conference. Confirmation and hotel information will be sent to you shortly. Please feel free to bring any your organizational materials to the workshop for display and dissemination purposes. We estimate that there will be 100 plus attendees to the conference.

Kindly let us know the names and contact information of the additional person who is entitled to attend the workshop under your generous sponsorship level, as soon as possible, in order to ensure they receive workshop information and to be listed on our participants list.

Please contact us if you have any additional questions and/or concerns. You can contact Stuart Slote, Energy Codes Project Manager at (802) 456-7409 for this purpose. Thank you again! We very much appreciate Unitil/Fitchburg Gas and Electric Co.'s financial support for and participation in NEEP's regional efforts to transform markets for energy efficiency.

Sincerely yours,

Susan E. Coakley Executive Director

Quan E. Coally

Also at the workshop, NEEP for the first time presented awards of recognition for excellence and special efforts. Three organizations received awards for their support of building codes that encourage energy efficiency:

- The *Trade Ally Award* to NAIMA (North American Insulation Manufacturers Association)
- The State Agency Award to the Massachusetts Board of Building Regulations and Standards
- The Program Administrator Award to National Grid

NEEP intends to broaden the scope of the awards program so it can recognize more allies, partners and sponsors for their commitments and efforts to increase energy efficiency in homes, buildings, and industry throughout the Northeast region of the United States.

Again, thanks for your support or our annual workshop. We appreciate all of your efforts!

Sincerely yours,

Susan E. Coakley Executive Director

### Mailloux, Ed

Sarah Hirtle [sah668@home.com] From: Tuesday, January 22, 2002 11:51 AM Sent: Gregory F. Rahe; Aa7790@aol.com To: Ed Mailloux

Cc:

Re: Final Student Counts Subject:

Greg, beople enrolled in the 100 series, and 45 MA people in the 200 series in There were (95 MA) 2001.

---- Original Message -----

From: "Gregory F. Rahe" <grahe@greennet.net>

To: <Aa7790@aol.com>

>

Cc: "Ed Mailloux" <mailloux@unitil.com> Sent: Friday, January 18, 2002 6:21 AM

Subject: Final Student Counts

```
> Hi Alan:
> Would you please provide me with the final 2001 tally's for:
> Metric #1 (# of folks in MA enrolled in course work for the
> NEEP-operated Level 1 Training & Certification Program, and
> Metric #2 (# of folks in MA enrolled in course work for the
> NEEP-operated Level 2 Training & Certification Program?
> Thanks very much.
> Greg
> **************
> Gregory F. Rahe
> 20 Merrimac Square, Suite 2
> Merrimac, MA 01860
> Phone (978)346-4003
> Fax (978)346-4006
> Email: grahe@greennet.net
```

# EFFICIENT PROGRAM DELIVERY Status - December 31, 2001

Residential	Annual kWh	Wghted Avg	Lifetime kWh	Wghted Avg   Lifetime kWh   Expenses To-   Lifetime kWh	Lifetime kWh
(Excl. Low-Income)	To-Date	Lifetime	To-Date	Date	per \$ spent
Energy Star Homes Program	-	23	-	\$ 40,316	
Energy Star Appliances	16,632	15	249,480	\$ 100,406	
Energy Star Lighting	527,725	10	5,277,250	\$ 84,353	
Residential Efficiency / RCS Pilot	138,733	11	1,526,063	\$ 161,945	
Residential Energy Star Trade-In	1	15	•	\$ 4,702	
Res R&D	1	•	•	\$ 11,859	
Web Development	'	1	•	\$ 21,596	
Average Residential	060,689	10	7,052,793 \$	\$ 425,177	16.6

Commercial & Industrial	Annual kWh	Wghted Avg	Lifetime kWh	Lifetime kWh Expenses To- Lifetime kWh	Lifetime kWh
	To-Date	Lifetime	To-Date	Date	per \$ spent
Sm Commercial & Industrial	234,812	15	3,522,180	\$ 177,329	
Comprehensive Efficiency	2,896,531	14	40,551,434	\$ 592,910	
C&I R&D - All	•	•	•	\$ 34,941	
DLC	'	1	1	\$ 34,365	
Motors	1	•	1	\$ 30,734	
HVAC	1	•	1	\$ 25,591	
Comp Air	,	•	1	- &	
O&M Training	-	_	_	\$ 11,461	
Average C&I	3,131,343	14	44,073,614 \$	\$ 907,332	48.6

1. Calculated as actual lifetime kWh saved per dollar spent vs. Planned lifetime kWh saved per dollar spent.

2. "Dollars Spent" includes: Program Design, Administration, Marketing, M&E, Rebates and 3rd Pty Audits. Does not include performance incentives.

## Differences from 2001 Annual Report

Savings at meter (before loss adjustments)

Costs from 2001 Annual Report - Table 4 a. Total Residential (excl Low Income) - \$425K

b. Total C&I - \$1017k - \$109 (Shareholder Incentive) = \$908k

c. EStar Lighting - difference in kWh due to revised # of wigdets and savings per widget d. Avg Res - due to booking inconsistencies, did not include torchiere costs or savings in 2001 calculation.

They will not count toward 2002 calculation.